

Date: Fri, 21 May 93 04:30:50 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #158  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 21 May 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 158

Today's Topics:

11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
    More on no-code  
    No-Code Stupidity (2 msgs)  
    Put up or Shut up! (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 16:48:00 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
: In article <1993May20.091045.24159@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:  
: >Anybody who's willing to take on the IRS \*and\* the Demopublicans can't  
: >be all bad however. Being in the right isn't always popular, or safe.  
:  
: Just as David Kouresh, right? ;-)  
I didn't know you were a BD Paul? ;-)

Dan

--

\*-----\*  
\* Daniel D. Todd                      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa                      \*

```

*                Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu                *
*                Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102                *
*                Davis CA 95616                                *
*-----*
*        I do not speak for the University of California....  *
*        and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!          *
*-----*

```

```

-----
Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 18:02:41 GMT
From: csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: More on no-code
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

```

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:
: In article <1993May20.093239.24387@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:
: >No, I contend that your point is irrelevant. The Morse tests were not
: >designed to relieve crowding. That may be a side effect on the HF Extra
: >phone segments, but better, more relevant, ways of relieving crowding are
: >available if that's the goal. Testing skills on an unrelated mode to
: >achieve a side effect on a different mode is illogical, arbitrary, and
: >capricious.
:
: I'm willing to concede that it is in fact a side effect, but it is still
: relevant, given spectrum usage patterns. There are, however, different

```

What is the main non-side effect again?

Dan

```

--
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu                *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102                *
*                    Davis CA 95616                                *
*-----*
*        I do not speak for the University of California....  *
*        and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!          *
*-----*

```

```

-----
Date: Thu, 20 May 93 16:40:26 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!

```

nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9w0T4B5w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>All question pools would be deleted. In other words, no longer can one  
>"buy" the exact questions and answers, take and pass the written exam,  
>and learn nothing in the process. To those hams who remember how it was  
>in the "old days," the FCC gave the tests and there was no such thing as  
>question pools as we know them today.

Remember the BASH books? Remebering that approach just made me realize that there really is no way to keep the question pool out of the hands of potential examinees. Given that, the only workable solution is ZV's of making the pool so large as to make memorization impossible. I'd say 4-5x the current pool would be sufficient.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 16:46:16 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: No-Code Stupidity  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

[Dana Deletia]

: A suggestion, along Dana's lines: Delete the 20 wpm requirement, and  
: replace it with 13 wpm (for Extra only). Modify the Novice to duplicate  
: the current Codeless Technician, meaning the Novice will be the "entry  
: level" ticket. The Technician will remain the same as the "old" Tech  
: (meaning the new Tech Plus). On General and Advanced, the Morse  
: requirement would be reduced to 5 wpm.

:  
: That was the sugar...and now the medicine.

:  
: All question pools would be deleted. In other words, no longer can one  
: "buy" the exact questions and answers, take and pass the written exam,  
: and learn nothing in the process. To those hams who remember how it was  
: in the "old days," the FCC gave the tests and there was no such thing as  
: question pools as we know them today. You learned the "right stuff" by

: studying an ARRL License Manual, or an AMECO Theory Course, and went in  
: and took the test. You learned. Furthermore, I suggest that each class of  
: license have specific learning objectives, which should be clearly  
: defined.

:

: Opinions?

There is a thread currently that is discussing this exact same thing. It  
does seem that your suggestion is a little on the oderate side actually.  
Join us in the other thread to keep as much of this together as possible.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 18:01:46 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Put up or Shut up!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

My suggestion of using templates for the written exam was to eliminate the  
need to have a huge question pool which would consume a lot of work to  
develop and maintain. The existing question pool is large enough if the  
content portion of the questions is parameterized. As an example, instead  
of asking a question like:

Q: Image communication is permitted on what portion of the 15 meter band:

- A) 21,225 kHz - 21,300 kHz
- B) 21,000 kHz - 21,100 kHz
- C) 21,200 kHz - 21,450 kHz
- D) 21,100 kHz - 21,450 kHz

where the person being examined can remember that the answer to the  
question about image and 15 meters is C. My suggestion is that a program  
with a table of the 15 meter band plan could generate an equivalent  
question that can't be memorized. The knowledge to answer the question  
would need to be known, not just C.

Even with a multiple choice exam, templates would be \*far\* better than the current fixed question pool. What would be fixed is the template and range of possibilities for the template.

A computer would not be needed to be dragged along to the testing session as the exams could be printed up ahead of time. An option could be included to allow the answers to be arranged in a certain order such that plastic grading overlays as mentioned in a previous post could still be used. Obviously a number of different overlays would be needed to prevent the examinees from knowing the overlay.

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: Thu, 20 May 93 17:24:52 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!  
oz.plymouth.edu!r\_fussel@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Put up or Shut up!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May20.160154.21376@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

>My suggestion of using templates for the written exam was to eliminate the  
>need to have a huge question pool which would consume a lot of work to  
>develop and maintain. The existing question pool is large enough if the  
>content portion of the questions is parameterized. As an example, instead  
>of asking a question like:

>

>Q: Image communication is permitted on what portion of the 15 meter band:

>

>A) 21,225 kHz - 21,300 kHz

>B) 21,000 kHz - 21,100 kHz

>C) 21,200 kHz - 21,450 kHz

>D) 21,100 kHz - 21,450 kHz

>

>where the person being examined can remember that the answer to the  
>question about image and 15 meters is C. My suggestion is that a program  
>with a table of the 15 meter band plan could generate an equivalent  
>question that can't be memorized. The knowledge to answer the question  
>would need to be known, not just C.

>

>Even with a multiple choice exam, templates would be \*far\* better than the  
>current fixed question pool. What would be fixed is the template and range  
>of possibilities for the template.

>

>A computer would not be needed to be dragged along to the testing session  
>as the exams could be printed up ahead of time. An option could be  
>included to allow the answers to be arranged in a certain order such that  
>plastic grading overlays as mentioned in a previous post could still be  
>used. Obviously a number of different overlays would be needed to prevent  
>the examinees from knowing the overlay.

I like that idea alot. I think not only would it would a better test, it would be more efficient too. I do have one point to make, though. I Used to be the kind of person to try to memorize the question pool. It pretty much worked until I got to my advanced test. It is my opinion the advanced test is the hardest, because of the complexity of the subject matter presented. IT was hard for me because I hadent taken algebra 2 and I didn't understand the trig that I needed to know. I tried to memorize the question pool, and it just did not work. To get to the point, actuallyt learning the information is usually better than memorizing toe question pool. My mother was mad because I was putting more time into upgrading my lkicence than my school work.:). I guess I'm babbling, but I'm out of this dump in 2 days, and I need to vent my excitment :).

Ron

N1HIB

See, I can be a nice guy too!

If you are gonna flame me, beter do it soon, I'm out of here in 2 days.

---

-----

Date: Thu, 20 May 1993 17:22:57 GMT

From: concert!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!

othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Put up or Shut up!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

[Todd deleted again]

:

: The problem with this approach, and the reason standardized tests use  
: multiple choice, is that most questions can be answered with different  
: words while still being correct. Thus the exam becomes subject to  
: interpretation errors by the examiners. We see examples of these kinds  
: of interpretation errors all the time here with people misunderstanding  
: another's meaning. Multiple choice limits the chance of interpretation  
: error by the examiners. The questions still have to be well written to  
: prevent interpretation errors by the examinee, but that's easier because  
: the question can be subject to widespread testing while an individual

: answer cannot.

That is certainly true for IQ tests etc. but I'm not certain that it applies for amateur exams. Could we just issue a "grade softly" directive? There seem to be a plethora of simple fill in the blank questions that would be difficult to misunderstand the question and the answer.

: The usual complaint about multiple choice exams is that the question pool can be easily memorized. The obvious solution to that problem is to make the question pool so large that memorization is more difficult than just learning the material. Keeping the answers private is not a solution because it allows no independent check on the fairness of the exam. Computers can be a help with managing large question pools. It's relatively easy to have a computer generate a new test for each applicant by drawing questions at random from each of the material groups to be covered.

I don't feel it's such a difficult issue to keep the pool private. If the Q's are randomly chosen what is the need to verify the fairness of the exam? If each person is allowed to review their exam after grading they will be free to question fairness at the time of the exam. It would make sense then to have VE's report what questions were challenged and then the coordinators can yank the questions if one shows up often as being misinterpreted by examinees. Isn't this how they do it already? If the pools were enlarged by a factor of 100 let's say that would give something like 30,000 questions per element or so. I think that would cover just about all questions and mutations of most of the topics. I'd hate to be the one who types the pool into a free-ware program's data file.

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 16:33:02 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.075511.16555@ke4zv.uucp>,

<1993May19.190315.14206@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May20.093239.24387@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May20.093239.24387@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>No, I contend that your point is irrelevant. The Morse tests were not  
>designed to relieve crowding. That may be a side effect on the HF Extra  
>phone segments, but better, more relevant, ways of relieving crowding are  
>available if that's the goal. Testing skills on an unrelated mode to  
>achieve a side effect on a different mode is illogical, arbitrary, and  
>capricious.

I'm willing to concede that it is in fact a side effect, but it is still relevant, given spectrum usage patterns. There are, however, different means of achieving the same goal. Perhaps, for example, we could make spectrum usage a direct function of license class. For example, given our hypothetical three license classes, give the lowest class the ability to use HF, but only 500 Hz at a time. As the most populous license class, want to bet that someone will manage to come up with an ultracheap advanced digital mode to meet the demand?

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 17:07:51 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.074459.16472@ke4zv.uucp>,  
<1993May19.184535.13332@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May20.123327.25609@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <1993May20.123327.25609@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>It's true that I'm not working on HF SS at the moment, but neither are you.  
>Instead I'm continuing to work on a time compressed slotted simplex repeater  
>project at UHF with some bright no coders.

Much of my work is in algebraic coding theory and systems, so I'm trying to concentrate my efforts there, in creating cost effective systems. I'm trying to make something workable out of meteor burst...

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."



->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 16:53:47 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.065957.16039@ke4zv.uucp>,  
<1993May19.183536.12841@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May20.105111.25149@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: No Code Debate

In article <1993May20.105111.25149@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>I think that deep down you fall into the third group. Your contentions  
>about Morse as a crowding filter are thin.

You'll have to forgive me, Gary, but this is a new experience for me. I don't  
think I've ever been psychoanalyzed over the net before. ;-)

Seriously, I could impugn your motives as well, but I suspect that would  
not be productive in the long run. Not fun, either.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: Thu, 20 May 93 16:24:15 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!  
nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.134443.19291@ke4zv.uucp>,  
<1993May19.185307.13745@leland.Stanford.EDU>, <1993May20.091045.24159@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: 11m vs Hams (was No-Code Stupidity)

In article <1993May20.091045.24159@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>Anybody who's willing to take on the IRS \*and\* the Demopublicans can't  
>be all bad however. Being in the right isn't always popular, or safe.

Just as David Kouresh, right? ;-)

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: 20 May 93 19:53:59 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May19.225219.170929@locus.com>, <9w0T4B5w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>,  
<1993May20.164026.17851@leland.Stanford.EDU>  
Subject : Re: No-Code Stupidity

paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>Remember the BASH books? Remebering that approach just made me realize that  
>there really is no way to keep the question pool out of the hands of  
>potential examinees.

Funny, the LSAT/GMAT exams do a pretty good job. I guess that just shows  
you how inefficient government is, and how well private industry can do  
the job.

MD

```
--
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ / Since I *OWN* SBS.COM,
-- Domain: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.risc.net / these opinions generally
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz / reflect those of my
-- Telebit: +1 401 455 0347 / company...
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #158

\*\*\*\*\*